

Remarks

In the second non-final Office Action mailed on 5 February 2007, the Examiner rejected claims 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. 101 as directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 1-15 were found to be allowable.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's objections and rejections, and request reconsideration and withdrawal of same. Applicants have amended claims 1 and 16 to clarify that the M PHYs available for use to process the I/O request are a portion of the n PHYs associated with the SAS wide port. Applicants have further amended claims 1, 8, 9, 11, 12 and 16 to clarify that the I/O request corresponds to an original SAS frame, and the original SAS frame is divided into a plurality of smaller SAS frames. As described in the specification, I/O request and frame are essentially used interchangeably. Those of ordinary skill in the art will recognize that an I/O request within a SAS domain is transferred as a SAS frame between components of the SAS domain.

35 U.S.C. §101 Rejection

The Examiner rejected claims 16-22 as directed to non-statutory subject matter suggesting that the claims recite a non-tangible result. The Examiner suggests that the various means elements recited point to the specification as supporting only a software driver and the Examiner suggests such is not a tangible result. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection. First, the means read on various embodiments including, for example, a software driver operable in a host computer (e.g., Enhanced SAS Driver 332 of FIG. 3), a functional element with an enhanced SAS initiator of a SAS domain (e.g., Enhanced SAS Initiator 102 of FIG. 1), and a functional element within an enhanced SAS expander (e.g., Enhanced SAS Expander 404 of FIG. 4). Applicants submit each of these exemplary embodiments represent a tangible embodiment of the recited means. Claim 16 is intended to cover all these exemplary embodiments and their respective structural equivalents. Dependent claims 20, 21, and 22 each recite a narrowing limitation limiting to one of these three exemplary embodiments (and its structural equivalent).

Applicants respectfully maintain that the rejected claims as presently submitted clearly produce a tangible result - namely: they provide a structure for management of a

SAS wide port to transmit information over M of the n PHYs of a SAS wide port. As discussed throughout the application this system (or associated methods) better utilize available bandwidth of a SAS wide port as compared with prior techniques. With due respect, Applicants request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 16-22.

Conclusion

Claims 1-15 are allowed. Applicants have traversed and thoroughly discussed the Examiner's §101 rejection of claims 16-22 and have requested reconsideration and withdrawal of same.

No additional fees are believed due. Should any issues remain, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel N. Fishman/
Daniel N. Fishman (Reg. No. 35,512)
Duft Bornsen & Fishman, LLP
1526 Spruce Street, Suite 302
Boulder, CO 80302
(303) 786-7687
(303) 786-7691 (fax)